

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated December 31, 2007. In this Office Action, all presently pending claims are rejected as unpatentable over Lee et al., (USP 6,336,137) (hereafter, "Lee").

Interview with Examiner

Applicant thanks Examiner Coulter for the courtesies shown at the interview on March 24, 2008. No agreement is reached with respect to any pending claims. Applicant has reviewed the Examiner's Interview summary and concurs with the statements therein.

Amendments to the Claims

Independent Claim 1 is amended to clarify the features of the invention more clearly by reciting a central processor unit, a memory device and that a graphics protocol engine resident on the client computer receives information from a server computer in accordance with capability information is exchanged between the client computer and the server computer.

A graphics protocol engine is described at page 4, line 13. The lack of an execution environment on the client computer is described at page 4, line 10. Rendering drawing actions on drawables is described at page 4, line 25. Support for capability exchange feature is at page 5, line 8-9; page 27, line 20 to page 31, line 20. Virtualized display is supported at page 27, lines 10-14. Accordingly, no new matter is added with the amendments to the claim 1. Examiner is respectfully requested to review and enter the amendment.

U.S. Patent 6,076,109 to Kikinis is distinguishable from the amended claim 1 in that Kikinis downloads a modified HTML page to be displayed on a small browser

program running on the client. See Col 10, lines 37-44. Lee also has the same infirmity. Furthermore, neither Lee nor Kikinis describes the feature of exchanging capability information between the client and the server. Therefore claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Lee and Kikinis. Claims 2-15 being dependent from Claim 1 are believed to be patentable over the cited references because Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the cited references.

Dependent Claims 5,6,8,9 and 10 are amended to show dependency from Claim 1 instead of claim 4. No new matter is added as a result of this change.

Independent Claim 16 recites “to use the compound request message to update a display state of the client computer” which is not in either Lee or Kikinis. Therefore Claim 16 is believed to be patentable over the cited art. Claims 17-28, which depend on Claim 16 are patentable because Claim 16 is patentable.

Claim 29 is canceled.

Independent Claim 30 is clarified by reciting the steps of:

exchanging client capability information with the server
computer;
receiving, at the client computer, user input for the client-side
application program;
transmitting, to the server computer, user input received at
the client computer for interpretation by the client-side application
program running on the server computer; and

receiving, at the client computer, updates of user interface of
the client-side application program from the server computer, via a
remote display protocol
thereby allowing user interface to be virtualized and served
across the wireless network to the client computer.

As argued with respect to claim 1, client capability information exchange is not in Lee or Kikinis, and neither Lee nor Kikinis executes a client-side application program on the server computer.

Claim 34 is amended to clarify the feature that the user interface can be multi-modal. Support for this language is in the Specification at page 11 (describing Figs. 9 & 10) and corresponding text.

Claim 35 is corrected to recite the features described above, and to recite method steps more clearly. No new matter is added as a result of the modifications to either claim 30 or claim 35. Examiner is respectfully requested to review and enter them.

Conclusion

All pending claims are believed to be patentable over the cited art. In light of the amendments and the arguments, further review and early allowance are requested. No fee is due with this response.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: March 31, 2008

S/Naren Chaganti (44,602)
Naren Chaganti
713 The Hamptons Lane,
Town & Country, MO 63017
(650) 248-7011 phone
Attorney for the Applicant

Certificate of Electronic Filing

I certify that on the date shown below I filed this paper via the Electronic Filing system.

Date: March 31, 2008

S/Naren Chaganti (44,602)
Naren Chaganti